

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/615,536	07/08/2003	Frank J. Perhats SR.	1107-0003	8222
7590 06/04/2004		EXAMINER		
Joel H. Bock Cook, Alex, McFarron, Manzo, Cummings & Mehler, Ltd. 200 West Adams Street - Suite 2850			DUVERNE, JEAN F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2839	
Chicago, IL 6	0606		DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/615,536	PERHATS, FRANK J.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jean F. Duverne	2839				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sh et with the c	orrespond nce address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timer within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day- will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 July 2003</u> .						
,—	action is non-final.					
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atom Application (FTO*192)				

Application/Control Number: 10/615,536 Page 2

. Art Unit: 2839

DETAILED ACTION

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is less than fifty words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 9-10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tomlin et al (US006488551B1).

Tomlin's device discloses a terminal connector (10, 12 or 110, 112) for connecting electrical circuit to pre-existing relay (24), the relay including terminal blade (24a), the connector comprising: a generally planar body, and first and second connector tabs (16 or 116) formed in the planar body, said first and second displaceable tabs being spaced apart to define a tab slot there between, the tab slot at 10e or 110e formed 16c or 116c being adapted for receiving the terminal blade (24a) of the relay, whereupon the tabs engage the terminal blades; a substrate carrier engaging with the terminal connector; a first and second folding tabs (16) as being the folding tabs (see fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 5, 8, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Tomlin et al (US006488551B1).

In regard to claims 3, 8, Tomlin's device discloses the aforementioned limitations, but fails to disclose the size of the slot. It would have been obvious of matter of design choice to have the tab slot less than the blade terminal width, since such modification would have involved a mere change in size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

In regard to claim 5, 13, Tomlin's device discloses the aforementioned limitations, but fails to disclose the tab second end as being curled. It would have been obvious of matter of design choice to have the tab second end as being curled, since such modification would have involved a mere change in shape of a component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Dailey, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1976).

Application/Control Number: 10/615,536

→ Art Unit: 2839

5. Claims 2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Tomlin et al (US006488551B1) in view of Seo et al (US 20030017727A1).

Tomlin's device discloses the aforementioned limitations, but fails to disclose the wire connection. Seo's device discloses the planar body with the wire connecting features (see figs. 8A, 8B, 9: see wire post and wire). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time the time the invention was made to add the wire connecting features in order add other components to Tomlin's device.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean F. Duverne whose telephone number is (571) 272-2091. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-7:30, Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on (571) 272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

• Art Unit: 2839

Any response to this action may be mailed to: Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

For additional information regarding this new address, which was effective May 1, 2003, see Correspondence with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, 68 Fed. Reg. 14332 (March 25, 2003).

Or Faxed to:

(703) 872-9306.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Plaza 4, Fourth Floor (Receptionist) 2201 South Clark Place, Arlington, Virginia.

JFD

05/26/2004

Jean Frantz Duverne

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2839